

COMPENSATION REVIEW COMMISSION

Report of
Information Received by the Commission
and
Recommendations

February 16, 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	4
Committee Activities to Date	5
Authorization and Appointment	5
Meeting Dates	5
Summary of Information Received by the Commission	6
1. What State Legislators Make	6
Legislative Compensation	6
Salary	6
Per Diem	6
Benefits	7
Legislative Expenses	8
Office Furniture Allowance	8
Office Expense Allowance	8
Legislative Staff	9
Computers	9
2. What Statewide Elected Officials Make	9
3. The Demands and Responsibilities of the Office	9
State Legislators	9
Size of the District	9
Time and Workload	10
Expenses	10
Campaign Finance Issues	11
Statewide Elected Officials	11
Governor	11
Attorney General	11
Secretary of State	12
Commissioner of Agriculture	12
Lieutenant Governor	12
Treasurer	12
Comparison of Executive Branch Departments	13
4. Appointed Department Heads	13
5. What are the highest salaries in state government today? What positions are these?	14

6. Equal Compensation Between Members	14
House vs. Senate	14
7. Should All Statewide Elected Officials Be Paid the Same Salary	15
Offices Having the Same Salary in Each State	16
8. What the Legislature Looks Like	17
Experience	17
Party Affiliation	17
Race	17
Gender	17
Age	17
Education	17
Occupation	17
9. How the Commission Should Proceed in Conducting its Study	18
Difficult Task/Take Necessary Time	18
Examples of Procedure for Other Pay Plans/ Civil Service/ Judicial Comp. Commission	18
Specific Procedural Suggestions	19
Salary vs. All Aspects of Compensation/ Benefits	20
Legislation/ Changes Needed	20
Recommendations	21
Appendices	23

OVERVIEW

The Compensation Review Commission, created by Act No. 1040 of the 1999 Regular Session of the Legislature (R.S. 42:1481 et seq.), submits this report in compliance with R.S. 42:1485. Due to the constraints of time -- the commission was appointed after the Organizational Session of the Legislature in January, 2000, and a report was required by February 24, 2000 -- this report will include:

- Commission Activities to Date
- A Summary of Information Received by the Commission
- Commission Recommendations (primarily for changes in the creating legislation).

The commission has not had sufficient time to make any specific recommendations for changes in salary or other compensation at this time, but will continue to make a thorough review of these issues.

Based on testimony and information received, the consensus view of the commission is that the commission should:

- Be deliberate in its proceedings and take the time necessary to do a thorough job
- Not limit itself to the consideration of salary only, but should consider all forms of compensation, benefits, and expenses
- Consider each statewide elected office individually.

COMMISSION ACTIVITIES TO DATE

Authorization and Appointment

The Compensation Review Commission was created by Act 1040 of the 1999 Regular Session. The commission consists of nine members: two members appointed by the president of the Senate, two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one member appointed by the chief justice of the Louisiana Supreme Court, and four members selected by a majority of the statewide elected officials. The commission is charged with making a study of the salaries payable to statewide elected officials and members of the legislature and submitting its recommendations concerning the salaries of these officials to the legislature sixty days prior to the commencement of any regular session of the legislature in an even-numbered year. Thereafter, a report may be submitted every two years at any regular session of the legislature in an even-numbered year. The report shall be submitted to the offices of the speaker of the House of Representatives and the president of the Senate, who shall distribute copies to each member of their respective house of the legislature. The salaries recommended in the report take effect on the first day of July of the year in which the report was submitted if approved by concurrent resolution adopted by a favorable vote of the majority of the elected members of each house. (See Appendix 1.6)

Meeting Dates

The commission met on January 19, 2000. Loy Weaver was unanimously elected chairman of the commission. Herbert Boydstun was elected vice chairman. This meeting was an organizational meeting. The commission reviewed the enabling act, discussed the criteria which might be necessary to determine what is fair compensation, and determined what information and speakers would be necessary to provide assistance. (See Appendix 1.0)

The commission met on February 8, 9, and 10, 2000, for the purpose of receiving testimony from past and present legislators, legislative officers, legislative assistants, the governor, statewide elected officials, cabinet level officials, lobbyists, and citizens groups and information regarding the process used by the Judicial Compensation Commission and the State Civil Service Commission in reviewing and setting salaries for judges and state employees. (See Appendices 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

The commission also met on February 16, 2000, for the purpose of reviewing and approving this commission report. (See Appendix 5.0)

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION RECEIVED BY THE COMMISSION

1. What State Legislators Make

Legislative Compensation

Legislative compensation generally ranges between \$32,000 and \$33,000 per year and is disbursed in two separate types of payments, "Salary" and "Per Diem". Salary has two components, one which is termed "salary" and the other which is termed "monthly expense allowance", but treated as "salary" for all relevant purposes. Each element of legislative compensation is detailed more completely below.

Salary

The "salary" of each member of the legislature is currently set in R.S. 24:31.1 as \$16,800 per year. The salaries for the elected leadership of each legislative body is set higher than for the other members. The Speaker of the House (R.S. 24:502) and Senate President (R.S. 24:506) have a salary of \$32,000, while the Speaker Pro Tempore (R.S. 24:504) and the President Pro Tempore (R.S. 24:507) have a salary of \$24,500.

R.S. 24:31.1 additionally provides that \$500 per month (\$6,000 per annum), labeled as a "monthly expense allowance", be paid to each legislator in the same manner as his salary. Therefore, each legislator is entitled to \$1,900 per month, from which all traditional payroll withholdings (such as taxes) are deducted.

Therefore, the total annual payment to each legislator is \$22,800. This does not include per diem or any vouchered expenses.

	Total Monies Due Each Legislator as a Form of Salary (annual)
Salary	\$16,800
Monthly Expense Allowance	\$6,000 (\$500 per month paid to each legislator in the same manner as salary and treated as salary for tax purposes)
Total	\$22,800

Per Diem

Per diem literally means "for each day" and is the payment to which each legislator is entitled for each day of a legislative session. R.S. 24:31 sets the per diem for legislators at "the rate allowable for per diem deduction under Section 162(h)(1)(B)(iii) of Title 26 of the United States Code" for Baton Rouge. The current federal rate is \$103 per day and is subject to increase or decrease on an annual basis. Neither the State of Louisiana nor the legislature has any role in establishing the annual federal rate. At present, each

legislator is entitled to \$103 for each day of a regular legislative session (85 days in odd-numbered years and 60 days in even-numbered years). Each legislator is also be entitled to \$103 for each day of a special legislative session. Generally, the legislature has conducted approximately 25 days of special sessions in even-numbered years. Additionally, each legislator is entitled to \$103 for each day in which he/she attends an official meeting during the interim period between regular sessions, such as an interim meeting of a legislative committee of which the legislator is a member. The determination of whether an interim meeting is subject to the payment of per diem is left to the discretion of the Speaker of the House and the Senate President respectively. Legislators attend, on average, 20 days of such interim meetings per year (House average 22, Senate average 19). As these monies are not subject to any sort of voucher for expenses or receipt requirement, they are treated as earned income for tax purposes. For legislators who reside outside of a 50-mile radius of the capitol, this income may be offset by equivalent income tax deductions, without the need for supporting documentation, such as receipts.

	Even-numbered Year	Odd-numbered Year
Regular Session Per Diem	\$4,635	\$8,755
Special Session per Diem (25 days)	\$2,575	\$0
Interim Per Diem (20 days)	\$2,060	\$2,060
Total Per Diem	\$9,270	\$10,815
Total Salary + Per Diem	\$32,070	\$33,615

Legislators are also eligible for the same general benefit package as other state employees. Participation in the state retirement system is, however, expressly prohibited by R.S. 11:164, as legislators are deemed "part-time" officials. Of note, any "part-time" official who was participating in a public retirement system as of January 1, 1997, is entitled to remain and continue contributions and full participation. Generally the benefits available to legislators as state employees are as follows:

Benefits	Cost
State Employees Group Benefits (Health Insurance)	State - \$223.62 Legislator - \$223.62
Life Insurance (\$40,000)	State - \$18.40 Legislator - \$18.40
Dental Insurance and Supplemental Health Insurance	Legislator pays 100%
Deferred Compensation Program	Legislator contributes, "ZERO" State contribution

Legislative Expenses

Reimbursement of legislative expenses is handled the same, in some respects, and differently, in other respects, in the House of Representatives and Senate.

Office Furniture Allowance

Each newly elected legislator is allowed, by his/her respective body, \$2,000 for the purchase of furnishings for his/her district legislative office. This allowance may be expended for such items as furniture and office equipment. For each subsequent re-election the legislator is allowed an additional \$500 for like purchases. All furniture and equipment purchased under this allowance becomes property of the respective body, to be returned upon the legislator leaving office. Sometimes the outgoing legislator will make this furniture and equipment available to the incoming legislator, while other times, the outgoing legislator will attempt to purchase the furniture and equipment in the manner one would purchase surplus public property.

- **House** - Purchases in excess of the allowance may be made from the Representatives Supplemental Allowance Account (detailed below).
- **Senate** - In extraordinary cases, purchases in excess of the allowance may be authorized by the President of the Senate.

Office Expense Allowance

Each legislator is allowed \$500 each month to defray the expenses of operating a district legislative office. Use of this allowance requires documentation of expenses, including: office rent, utilities, and office supplies. Rent will be paid by the respective legislative body, directly to the lessor, upon presentation of a properly convected lease.

- **House** - Additionally, each Representative is allowed \$1,500 per month toward other expenses related to district office operation and the holding of the office. This allowance is known as the **Supplemental Expense Allowance** and accumulates each month if unused. A Representative may not draw against this allowance until he/she has expended the entire **Office Expense Allowance** each month. The following office expenses are charged against this allowance: telephone equipment and usage (including long distance), out-of-state travel on legislative business, interim in-state travel on legislative business, interim per diem for all interim meetings other than scheduled interim committee meetings, postage and mailing costs for nonpolitical mailings, specialized or additional computer software, district office rent in excess the **Office Expense Allowance**, and furniture and equipment purchases in excess of the **Office Furniture Allowance**. All expenditures from this allowance must be supported by appropriate documentation. At the end of each fiscal year a Representative may carry forward any balance in the account, not to exceed \$3,000.
- **Senate** - The Senate considered the adoption of a supplemental expense allowance, but did not do so. Rather, any additional monies for expenses such as postage for nonpolitical mailings or excess district office expenses may only be paid by the Senate upon specific approval by the President of the Senate. Generally the Senate does not allow reimbursement for any in-state travel which is constituent related, rather than expressly for a legislative purpose. However, the Senate does provide reimbursement for out-of-state travel,

interim per diem, telephone equipment and usage, and other expenses, without a fixed limit, upon approval by the President of the Senate. Further, the Senate does provide each Senator with an office in the State Capitol Building, along with a standard complement of furnishings and a computer.

Legislative Staff

Each legislator is allowed a maximum amount of money each month for use in hiring and compensating legislative staff, commonly referred to as a legislative assistant. Each legislative assistant is considered to be an employee of the respective body and is paid directly. The amount available is dependent on the years of experience of both the legislator and the legislative assistant, with annual increases statutorily provided. Each legislator may allocate the total funds available each month to one legislative assistant or have the total funds split between two or more legislative assistants.

Computers

Each legislator is allowed a laptop computer for his/her use, along with a standard computer set-up in his/her district office. As noted above, Senators also have the availability of an additional computer in their capitol office and Representatives may purchase or lease additional equipment from their Supplemental Expense Allowance.

A comparison of the House and Senate, taking into account everything available, finds that, by and large, each body provides relatively equal expense reimbursements, with the only significant difference being that the House allows for travel expenses for interim in-district travel on constituent business and the Senate provides the capitol office. For the other expenses, the differences are only in the manner of accounting and disbursement.

2. What Statewide Elected Officials Make

Staff memoranda submitted to the commission (See Appendix 2.10 and 2.12) provided information about the current salaries and benefits of statewide elected officials. Essential facts included that the governor is entitled to a salary of \$95,000 per year and the other statewide elected officials are paid an annual salary of \$85,000.

Benefits include membership in the State Employees Retirement System and the State Group Benefits Program (health and life insurance) on the same basis as other state employees, that is the state pays half of the insurance premium and 7.67% of salary to the retirement system while the employee pays 12.7%. (These officials may participate in an additional retirement benefit by paying an additional 1% of salary.)

The staff memoranda cited above also provide information on the availability of state cars to these officials and other special provisions for travel and vehicles.

3. The Demands and Responsibilities of the Office

State Legislators

The demands and responsibilities of a state legislator are not limited to exercising the legislative power of the state through the enactment of laws and the setting of public policy during the eighty-five or forty-five day annual sessions of the legislature. The responsibilities of a legislator encompass much more. As the commission heard from legislators, past and present, legislative assistants, officers of the legislature, and

lobbyists relative to the job responsibilities, both monetarily and physically of a state legislator, the testimony indicated that contrary to public perception, being a legislator is a full-time job.

Size of the District

The geographical size of a legislative district varies from district to district. While many house districts encompass one parish or a part of one parish, the majority of senate districts are multiparish districts. (See Appendix 2.16) There are some Senate districts which are as much as 200 miles long or wide. The average Senate district is 70 to 80 miles long or wide. In a multiparish district, whether in the House of Representatives or in the Senate, there may be many towns or villages and six to eight police juries or school boards, particularly when the district is primarily rural. Districts located in the extreme northern portion of the state create a hardship upon legislators who must travel to Baton Rouge for legislative meetings, often requiring two days of travel. One legislative assistant remarked that her legislator "could not have this job if the district included more than one parish".

Time and Workload

In recent years, the legislature has introduced an increased number of legislative instruments. Since 1972, the number of bills has increased from an average of 2,700 to more than 4,000. This has also occurred at a time that the days of the legislative sessions have been reduced, amounting to less time in which more legislative instruments must be considered. Additionally, because the number of days the legislature can meet in a given session is reduced, the days of per diem a legislator can claim is also reduced, effectively creating a cut in pay.

Legislative officers, legislative assistants, and legislators mentioned that the demands upon a legislator's time have increased substantially since the early eighties. Legislators have become ombudsmen for their constituents because of the size and complexities of government. One legislator mentioned that her office amounts to a complaint department. Assistance with social security benefits is the issue most asked of legislators and their staffs, even though it is not a state issue. Legislators are asked by constituents to assist with anything from the repaving of roads to getting TOPS benefits for their children. Legislators must attend meetings of their local school boards, church and civic association meetings, and hold constituent meetings during the course of a week. They often make as many as three speeches during a week regarding matters before the legislature or a committee on which the legislator serves.

During a legislative session, a legislator's day may begin at 7:00 a.m., making calls and having meetings with constituents. Committee meetings usually begin at 9:00 a.m., and may last well into the noon hour. The House of Representatives and the Senate usually convene at 1:00 p.m. or 1:30 p.m., and may not adjourn until 8:00 p.m. Frequently, a legislator's day may end at 11:00 p.m. A legislator's work week is typically more than 60 hours a week.

During the interim, however, the hours are typically the same, the schedule replacing committee meetings and legislative sessions with meetings with local governmental bodies, constituents and lobbyists. One lobbyist testified that the legislature is now being lobbied by 460 registered lobbyists representing more than 650 clients, in stark contrast to the early 1980's when 38 lobbyists represented 80 clients. Legislators are being inundated with information because of the explosion of technology, and the explosion of people and groups now being represented by lobbyists. This has generated larger amounts, and more precise information which must be processed within relatively short periods of time. Virtually every industry or trade is now represented by a lobbyist. The constituency of legislators has evolved to the point that almost every constituent is represented in one form or another through a trade group.

Expenses

The issue of unreimbursed expenses of legislators was emphasized throughout all the testimony concerning legislative compensation. Legislators sometimes have to supplement the pay of their legislative assistants, or hire additional assistants to cover the demands for assistance or for information from constituents in their districts. Although senators are given \$500 a month to cover office rental, in some urban areas that allowance may not meet the actual costs of rental. Additionally, there may be situations, such as the expanse of a multiparish district which may cause the need to rent additional office space. Secretary of the Senate, Michael S. Baer, mentioned that, in the Senate, in-state travel is not reimbursable specifically as an expense, nor is travel within the district. Travel outside of the state to legislative conferences must be approved by the Senate. Mailings are not reimbursed if they are of a political nature. Alfred "Butch" Speer, Clerk of the House of Representatives, explained the additional \$1,500 per month supplemental expense allowance used in the House of Representatives which alleviates some of the pressure of expenses, but he also outlined some expenses which may not be covered by the supplemental expense allowance, such as the establishment and staffing of a second district office.

Campaign Finance Issues

Many of the expenses which a legislator may have, which are not reimbursable or recoverable from any expense account, may be reimbursable from campaign funds. The Board of Ethics has determined that campaign funds may be used for expenses related to the holding of public office. Expenses related to the holding of public office have generally been determined by the board on a case-by-case basis. For example, campaign funds may be used to offset expenses for the use of a legislator's personal vehicle in a campaign, however, campaign funds may not be used to purchase clothing for an underprivileged child, or for membership dues and expenses related to an organization which holds a Mardi Gras parade. (See Appendix 4.5 and 4.6) Testimony was also elicited relative to the political propriety of using campaign funds for some of the ordinary expenses of holding the office of a legislator.

Statewide Elected Officials

The commission heard testimony from Governor Mike Foster, Attorney General Richard Ieyoub, Secretary of State Fox McKeithen, Janice Lansing, Undersecretary for the Department of Culture Recreation and Tourism for Lieutenant Governor Kathleen Blanco, State Treasurer John Kennedy and Commissioner of Agriculture, Bob Odom. Each outlined the duties of their offices.

Governor

The governor is the chief executive officer of the state. He is responsible for the enforcement of state laws. The office of the governor houses more than 45 agencies and offices, including the Division of Administration, the Department of Contractual Review, the Division of State Buildings, and the Facility Planning and Control Department.

Attorney General

Attorney General Ieyoub described the various functions of the office of the attorney general. The attorney general is the chief legal officer of the state, and has constitutional duties in addition to numerous statutory duties. They include the duty to assert or protect any right or interest of the state, to advise and assist in the prosecution of any criminal case, or prosecute, or intervene in any criminal action or proceeding. The attorney general is the head of the Department of Justice which includes the following divisions:

Administrative Division, Public Protection Division, Civil Division, Criminal Division, Litigation Division, Investigation Division, and the Gaming Division. Additionally, the office of the attorney general provides legal representation for many of the state boards and commissions, assists law enforcement agencies when requested, provides legal opinions to elected and appointed officials and answers more than 6,000 "duty calls" per year. The office includes the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit, handles major litigation such as the tobacco law suit, and is responsible for enforcing the tobacco settlement. The office has begun certain public outreach programs such as anti-drug programs, anti-discrimination programs, elderly advocacy and safe schools projects. The attorney general is responsible for a budget of \$33, 217, 246, and has more than 500 employees.

Secretary of State

Secretary of State Fox McKeithen is the chief elections officer of the state. He is the keeper of the Great Seal of the state of Louisiana and handles all matters related to elections other than voting machines and voter registration. He is the head of the Department of State. The department houses the Corporations/Business Division, which administers state corporation and trademark laws, the First Stop Shop which allows businesses to get information on every kind of license and permit required to start a particular business, the State Archives Division which is charged with preserving the history of the state both written and visual, the Old State Capitol Museum and several other museum programs. The office also administers the Uniform Commercial Code, and is the keeper of the official registry of all commissions. Mr. McKeithen indicated that his office is self-supporting, and has uniquely maintained the same number of employees since the beginning of his term. The Department of State has 185 employees and a budget of almost \$12,940,094.

Commissioner of Agriculture

Commissioner Bob Odom explained that the commissioner has constitutional duties to exercise all functions of the state relating to the promotion, protection, and advancement of agriculture, except research and educational functions expressly allocated to other state agencies. The office has continually added services including consumer services, which is concerned with weights and measures inspections, meat, produce and grain inspection programs, the marketing of Louisiana products, food distribution programs, forestry, soil and water programs, a boll weevil eradication program, a hardwood nursery in Monroe, welding and auto mechanic shops and the Louisiana Agricultural Finance Authority (LAFA), which helps farmers obtain financing for purchasing farm equipment, to name only a few. One of the latest programs added to the department is the Formosan Termite Program in New Orleans. Commissioner Odom indicated that the office is more active, especially at a national level, than other state agriculture offices. Commissioner Odom testified that the Department of Agriculture has more than 1700 employees and has a budget of \$118, 779, 419.

Lieutenant Governor

Janice Lansing, Undersecretary for the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism gave an overview of the scope of the Lt. Governor's office and duties. The office of lieutenant governor is the second highest elected position in the state and serves as the governor of the state in his absence. The Lt. Governor serves ex officio as a member of each committee, board, and commission on which the governor serves. She heads the office of the Lt. Governor and the Department of Culture Recreation and Tourism which is composed of seven agencies. She is in charge of several federally funded grant programs, including the LASERV grant. The Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism has responsibility for the state libraries, state museums, state parks, historical and archaeological preservation, the arts and cultural programs, the development of the film and video industry for the state, and tourism, which is the second largest industry in the state. Her

budget for the office of the Lt. Governor is \$5,000,000 with 16 employees; the budget for the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism is more than \$65,000,000 with approximately 700 employees.

Treasurer

John Kennedy, State Treasurer, is the head of the Department of the Treasury. The office is responsible for the custody and disbursement of state funds, accounting, depository control and investment of state funds, and has responsibility for the management, analysis, and control of state debt, and the issuance of bonds. The office also provides assistance to certain retirement boards. The treasurer indicated that his office has 60 employees, with a budget of \$6,000,000.

Comparison of Executive Branch Departments

The commission received information from the staff concerning the current budgets and number of employees of all executive branch departments. That information has been summarized, together with the salary of the department heads, in the table that appears as Appendix 6.1.

4. Appointed Department Heads

The commission received the testimony of two appointed department heads, Jack Caldwell, Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources, and James Jenkins, Secretary of the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries. The commission was interested in learning about the job duties and responsibilities, backgrounds and compensation of these appointed officials, in order to provide a bench-mark of comparison to the statewide elected officials.

Secretary Caldwell came to government from private industry, the practice of law and semiretirement. His private sector career was related to the oil and gas industry. He, admittedly, is financially comfortable from his private endeavors and was not significantly affected by the salary available for the position of secretary of the Department of Natural Resources, which at the time of his hire was approximately \$54,000. Subsequent to his accepting the position, the state, at the Governor's behest, raised the salary to \$85,000 with an annual merit increase available which puts the current salary at approximately \$88,400. The department employs approximately 500 full-time employees and 70 students. The full-time employees include a large number of engineers. Seven employees earn salaries in excess of \$70,000 per year. The average employee earns in the \$35,000 - \$45,000 range. He opined that the departmental factors to consider in setting the compensation of department heads, elected or appointed, should include the budget, the number of employees and the nature of the work. Each position or office should be evaluated independently and compensated accordingly. He acknowledged that governmental positions ordinarily do not pay as well as the private sector, but compensation must be reasonable in order to attract "first career" people. "First career" people are those who choose to serve in a governmental position as their primary livelihood, as opposed to "second career" people who have made their fortune and take the governmental position more for the public service aspect than as a primary way to earn a living and build a career. He classified himself as a "second career" person.

Secretary Jenkins likewise came to government from a private industry, however that private sector career was in business. He related that his experience in wildlife or fisheries management was limited to his own recreational hunting and fishing. His appointment was, he believes, based on his ability to administer a large, diverse department with a significant budget. He noted that if someone asked him how long redfish spawn, he would call his Assistant Secretary of Fisheries. Specific knowledge of the subject matter, he opined, was not important to his job. From his perspective, administering the entire department was the focus of the

secretary's job. The technical information was better left to the technical staff. On the issue of compensation he acknowledged that governmental salaries were traditionally lower than the private sector, but he noted that governmental retirement tended to be better than the private sector. An evaluation of "compensation" should include a review of the entire range of the elements of compensation, such as salary, benefits, and retirement.

Sec. Jenkins does not believe that compensation plays much of a role when a person considers a statewide position, be it appointed or elected. There is a sense of public service associated with the top jobs in the state (department heads) that allows for less than top-dollar salaries. Secretary Jenkins was unsure of his current salary (which is \$81,120) and stated that he would have served without compensation if the Governor had asked him to. While he did not use the phrase, he too is clearly a "second career" person. He does believe that the ample retirement program offered to government officials makes government service a good "first career" [inserting Secretary Caldwell's phrase] which then would allow someone to move on to something else after 20 - 25 years of service.

5. What are the highest salaries in state government today? What positions are these?

The Department of State Civil Service provided the commission with lists of classified and unclassified positions with annual salaries of \$70,000 or more sorted by department or agency. The lists included 276 classified positions at the \$70,000 or more level and 2,645 unclassified positions at that level. Only those unclassified positions reported to the Department of State Civil Service were included.

The distribution of the classified positions at this level ranged from highs of 65 in the Department of Transportation and Development, 41 in the Department of Health and Hospitals, and 36 in the LSU Medical Center (including the state hospitals) to several departments with one or none.

In looking at the distribution of the 2,645 unclassified positions at this level, it should first be noted that 1976 are located in the state colleges and universities and their management boards. Other higher education positions include 14 in the Board of Regents, 2 in LUMCON (Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium), 18 in the community and technical college system, and 166 in the LSU Medical Center and its hospitals. Also, 44 are local in nature (local housing authorities, port commissions, levee districts, and a registrar's office). In addition, 15 are members of boards and commissions that were apparently erroneously included because their annualized per diem would amount to more than \$70,000 even though they do not receive that much compensation. Of the remaining 410, the largest numbers are 176 in the Department of Health and Hospitals, many of whom are doctors, and 42 in the Department of Agriculture and Forestry. The lowest numbers are 1 in the Department of Public Service (the Public Service Commission secretary) and 1 in the Department of State Civil Service (the head of the Division of Administrative Law which is housed in that department as an independent agency), and 1 in the Lieutenant Governor's office.

The information contained in the lists is summarized in Appendix 6.2 in more detail.

6. Equal Compensation Between Members

House vs. Senate

The first witness to raise the question of parity or equity in the overall compensation schemes of the House and Senate was Senate Secretary Mike Baer. From his perspective, there are inequities in favor of House members. Salary, including statutory salary and the monthly expense allowance which is unvouchered, for a House member and a Senator are the same. While not the most significant issue, he does feel that this does amount to an inequity in favor of House members. Essentially there is the same salary despite a Senator's

responsibility for representation of approximately 2 ½ times as many citizens, each of whom feel they are entitled to call on the Senator, year-round, for assistance with a wide variety of issues.

Secretary Baer joined Clerk of House Butch Speer in testifying regarding the differences in the expense reimbursement schemes between the House and Senate. This difference, Baer asserts, often requires Senators to dip into their own pocket for expenses, thus having the effect of lowering what they retain in the way of compensation. The primary difference in structure is that the House funds a Supplemental Expense Account for each member in the amount of \$1,500 per month. This is in addition to the monthly expense allowance (which is really part of salary) and the Office Expense Allowance of \$500 per month, which is intended to defray the costs associated with renting and operating a district office. The Supplemental Expense Allowance provides a source of reimbursement for House members for certain expenses related to the holding of their office. Many of the expenses charged against this account are items which are either paid directly by the Senate, such as telephone charges, or reimbursable upon approval by the Senate President, such as per diem for attendance at task force meetings. Some items, which a House member can charge against the account, such as mileage for in-district travel on constituent business, are not reimbursable by the Senate under any circumstances. Senators, with generally larger geographic districts than their colleagues in the House are called on to travel just as much, if not more, to police jury meetings, city council meetings, etc. without the benefit of mileage reimbursement. This account, Secretary Baer concludes, gives an added benefit to House members despite the smaller population of House districts. This inequity, he opines, is also illustrated by the level of staffing available to a Senator and a House member, as the same level of funds are available for legislative assistant(s) for each, but the Senator has approximately 2 ½ times the constituency to serve.

Secretary Baer indicated that the inequities could be greatly alleviated by increasing the expenses provided to Senators. Give legislators the tools they need to do the job. "Tools" includes staff, expenses, and offices. He applauded the House implementation of the Supplemental Expense Allowance and lamented the Senate's decision not to follow suit. There was little discussion of a clear Senate advantage over the House; each Senator has a fully equipped office in the State Capitol Building.

Former Senate President Randy Ewing testified regarding the Senate opting not to implement any sort of fixed supplemental expense account. He also noted that it seems to be a good idea and seems to be working in the House. He noted that the relative sizes of the two bodies made it easier for him to personally review requests by Senators for expense reimbursements, such as travel and extra postage. With over 100 members, he supposed, it may be more difficult to closely review every member's expenses, so the pre-authorized allowance would provide the needed budgetary control in a practical manner. He suspects that the total expenses for House and Senate members was probably close to the same. He did see some possibility for inequity between geographically small and large districts, so some system taking size of district into account may be proper.

Representative Donald Ray Kennard testified that while senate districts have greater population and are often larger geographically, citizens call who they know or have heard of. Therefore, long-time incumbents will routinely take calls from citizens who reside outside of the district. Most such legislators handle those calls as they would any other.

7. Should all statewide elected officials be paid the same salary?

The commission members asked most of those who testified before the commission whether or not statewide elected officials should all be paid the same salary.

Taking the position that statewide elected officials should not be paid the same was Jim Brandt, director of

the Public Affairs Research Council. He suggested that each job be examined individually and that pay be based on the scope of each.

Former Senate President Randy Ewing also responded that pay should be based on responsibilities and size of the job, but he indicated that this would be very hard to accomplish.

Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources, Jack Caldwell, agreed that the nature of the work and the responsibilities of the job should be taken into account in making salary recommendations. Secretary Jenkins of the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, responding to a question as to whether pay should be based on responsibilities, agreed that budget, number of employees and the like should be taken into account.

Attorney General Richard Ieyoub suggested that the commission look at each department headed by the statewide elected officials individually rather than considering them altogether, and do whatever is necessary to make a fair determination. When asked why all of the officials are paid the same now, he responded that he did not know but that, perhaps, it has to do with the legislative process.

Secretary of State Fox McKeithen indicated that he thought it was fair for all statewide elected officials to be paid the same.

Some seemed to recognize both sides of the argument or did not wish to answer the question directly. Governor Foster, in answer to a commissioner, indicated that he is not sure whether all of the statewide elected officials should be paid the same amount. He added that there is a difference in the jobs, but he does not know. State Treasurer John Kennedy, not stating an opinion, urged if different salaries are to be recommended that the commission look at the actual duties of the office, not only the statutory duties.

Commissioner of Agriculture and Forestry, Bob Odom, while stating that responsibilities of the offices are different, declined to offer an opinion as to whether salaries should be different. Lobbyist Bud Mapes also declined to answer the question.

A review of a staff memorandum providing the currently available salaries of comparable officials in 19 other states (southern states and those with a population comparable to Louisiana's) indicates that there is no clear pattern in the states. A table of those positions paid the same in these other states follows. Note that in other states, some of these positions are not elected offices.

Offices Having the Same Salary in Each State

(Asterisk indicates offices with same salary)

State	Governor	Lt. Governor	Sec. of State	Attorney General	State Treasurer	Comr. of Insur.	Comr. of Elections	Comr. of Agric. & Forestry
Alabama			*		*		*	
Arizona			*		*			
Arkansas			*		*			
Colorado		*	*		*			
Florida			*	*	*			*
Georgia			+			+		+
Kentucky		*	*	*	*			*
Maryland		*		*	*			

State	Governor	Lt. Governor	Sec. of State	Attorney General	State Treasurer	Comr. of Insur.	Comr. of Elections	Comr. of Agric. & Forestry
Minnesota		*	*		*			
Mississippi			*		*	*		*
North Carolina		*	*	*	*	*		*
Oklahoma					*	*		
South Carolina			*	*	*			*
Tennessee			*		*	#		#
Texas				*	*			*
Virginia								
Washington								
West Virginia					*			*
Wisconsin			*		*			

+ Very close, but not the same.

Two other offices having the same salary, but different from the other pair that are the same.

8. What the Legislature Looks Like

Randy Haynie, president of Louisiana Governmental Studies, Inc., which published The Louisiana Legislature, 1996-2000 Grass-Roots Guide, gave valuable information on what the legislature looks like. (See Appendix 3.3)

Experience

Sixteen senators have House of Representative experience. A majority of the members of the legislature have been elected within the last eight to 12 years. Overall, the Senate as a body has more legislative experience. More and more individuals are serving only four to eight years. Forty-eight percent of House members have served one term or less.

Party Affiliation

The Senate is composed of 27 Democrats and 12 Republicans; the House of Representatives has 75 Democrats and 30 Republicans. In 1980, there were 39 Democrats in the Senate, and 95 Democrats in the House of Representatives.

Race

In the Senate, 30 members are white; nine are black. In the House of Representatives, 83 members are white, 22 are black.

Gender

The Senate is behind the growth trend of increased representation by females, with three females and 36 males. The House of Representatives has 21 females, and 84 males. This is the largest growth trend.

Age

The average age is 53 in the Senate and 50 in the House of Representatives.

Education

In 1980, in the Senate, 27 members had post-graduate degrees. Most of these were lawyers. Today, 18 members have post-graduate degrees; fifteen members have an undergraduate degree; six have a high school diploma.

In the House of Representatives, in 1980, 45 members had a post-graduate degree. The number of members with a post-graduate degree peaked in 1992, when 60 members held a post-graduate degree. Today, 57 members have a post-graduate degree, 29 members have an undergraduate degree and 19 members have a high school diploma.

Occupation

During the last four years, the Senate was composed as follows:

Attorneys	12	
Business owners	12	
Full-time legislators	3	
Agricultural/livestock	3	
Insurance	2	
Real Estate	2	
Health Care		1
Miscellaneous	4	

The House of Representatives was composed as follows:

Business owners	30	
Attorneys	24	
Full-time legislators	22	
Real Estate	6	
Educator	6	
Insurance	3	
Agricultural/livestock	3	
Health Care		1
Miscellaneous	10	

Trends

- The single largest growth trend with regards to the composition of the legislature is the increase in women in the legislature.
- Gender and race are two trends which should be given consideration as the commission decides compensation for the legislature.
- More members of the legislature are educators; fewer members are lawyers.
- Due to term-limits, an increased number of senators will have experience from service in the House of Representatives.

9. How the commission should proceed in conducting its study.

The commission asked for recommendations about its own procedure. Virtually every person who testified stressed the difficult nature of the commission's task. Many urged the commission to go slowly and to take the time necessary to do a thorough study. In addition, some testimony was received concerning specific recommendations for commission procedure. A summary of this testimony follows.

Difficult Task/Take Necessary Time

The governor specifically suggested that the commission take the necessary time to cover the difficult issue and not be rushed. Secretary of State Fox McKeithen echoed the sentiment that the commission should take the time necessary to give the matter full consideration. Speaker of the House Charles DeWitt urged the commission not to be sensitive on the time issue created by Act 1040. He pointed out that it is not necessary to act this year. Former Senate President Randy Ewing stressed that it was necessary for the commission to do a thorough study. PAR recommended that the commission not try to meet the February 24, 2000 deadline and suggested that the proper comparative study of the pay of legislators and statewide elected officials will take more time.

Examples of Procedure for Other Pay Plans/ Civil Service/ Judicial Compensation Commission

Some "how to" testimony was received from the Department of State Civil Service and the Judicial Compensation Commission.

Allen Reynolds, Director of State Civil Service, explained to the commission how civil service has established pay plans. He pointed out that the state civil service pay plan has a Medical Schedule and a General Schedule. The Medical Schedule is primarily based on market rates. The General Schedule includes 32 pay ranges and 2700 jobs. Each job was evaluated and a point factor for each thus determined and, based on the point factor, each was assigned to the appropriate pay range in the schedule. The point factor system was developed in 1987 to establish a hierarchical order of jobs based on the consensus of market value. Nine factors were used to determine the point factor for each job, each factor having levels within it with points assigned to each level. These factors include such things as education, experience, organizational control, persons contacted by the job holder, complexity, responsibility, and physical demand or hazards. The total points resulting from evaluating the job on the basis of these factors yielded the point factor that was used to assign the job to the appropriate pay range.

Mr. Reynolds related that "things are not static" and that adjustments and special tools, which he outlined, are necessary to keep up with market changes and changes in jobs and other changes. He explained the use of surveys to determine current market. He told the commission that the current pay grades for state civil service are significantly below market, 15 to 25% below market, and they are below the Southeastern states and the Central states. They are currently awaiting a new survey to compare ranges within Louisiana.

He also explained how civil service, at the request of the legislature by concurrent resolution, had developed a proposed pay plan for unclassified department officials. He explained that the plan is now out of date, but that it was developed to fit with the classified ranges at the time it was proposed.

Mr. James Coleman, vice chairman of the Judicial Compensation Commission, and Mr. Tim Palmatier, chief deputy judicial administrator, explained how the Judicial Compensation Commission has handled its work of making recommendations on judicial salaries. They explained that the commission, which was created in 1995, has a similar statutory responsibility to that of the Compensation Review Commission, but deals with

judges salaries. Their first report was made in 1996. The commission spent about a year on the study and employed Dr. Loren Scott, an economist at LSU, to study judicial salaries for the commission. The contract with Dr. Scott cost about \$15,000 and his assistance and report were very helpful. Dr. Scott has updated his report and this was used by the commission in preparing its recommendations and report this year. The recommendations this year are based on the average of three Southern states (Arkansas, Texas, and Mississippi). The commission will be recommending a series of 5% increases over the next three years to move closer to the average of these three states. The commission is funded by funds from the various judges associations.

Specific Procedural Suggestions

Testimony also included some suggestions for particular approaches or procedures to be used in the commission's work. Governor Foster suggested that the commission determine what is fair in the public and private sector across the country as a baseline and stated that this approach would make it difficult to criticize the commission's report.

The Secretary of the Senate, Mike Baer, discussed issues related to legislative compensation. He particularly focused on unreimbursed expenses of legislators necessitated by the duties of their office. He urged the commission to try to find a way to address such expenses and emphasized how such expenses differ with the size of districts and distances traveled as well as other factors. Former Senate President Ewing noted the difficulty and the necessity of comparing apples to apples. He pointed out that it is essential to be aware of differences in legislatures around the nation, differences in session schedules, bill loads, and other differences and that this has to be factored in when comparing compensation.

The attorney general urged the commission to examine each office. Treasurer Kennedy stressed the need to look at what each office actually does, namely, its actual responsibilities. Lieutenant Governor Blanco, through her representative, Janice Lansing of the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, suggested that the commission consider the constitutional order of the statewide elected offices.

In response to questions, both Speaker DeWitt and Senate President Hainkel agreed that the commission should receive public input in order to have public support.

Salary vs. All Aspects of Compensation/Benefits

Act 1040 provides for the commission to report its recommendations for the salaries of legislators and statewide elected officials and also provides a procedure for the recommended salaries to become effective upon approval by the legislature by concurrent resolution. The commission discussed the fact that it is difficult for the commission to consider salary without also considering other aspects of compensation and expenses as well as other benefits.

Testimony on this issue included comments of former Senate President Ewing who indicated that the commission needs to consider all compensation. He particularly discussed the issue of reimbursing the expenses of legislators, noting that the \$1,500 vouchered expense allowance now used by the House might be something to consider. He suggested that it is important to determine those expenses a legislator has that he must pay. Wildlife and Fisheries Secretary Jenkins also stated that the whole benefit package is important to getting and retaining good people. He cited retirement benefits as an example.

Legislation/Changes Needed

Testimony also touched on Act 1040, which created the commission, and suggestions that the commission recommend changes in that legislation.

- *Effective date of pay raise.* In response to a question about when the pay raises should be effective, this term or later, the governor indicated that pay raises have traditionally been effective for the next term.¹ PAR recommended that any salary increases that may be proposed become effective for the next term of office. Act 1040 provides that increases would become effective on July 1 of the year in which they are recommended by the commission.
- *Salary v. Compensation/Benefits.* As noted above, commission discussion and testimony before the commission suggest that the commission must consider and make recommendations for a broader range of compensation issues than salary only. PAR pointed out the need to amend the legislation creating the commission to clarify these issues.
- *Commission expenses.* Act 1040 provides that members of the commission receive no compensation but “shall be paid actual expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties as members.” The legislation provides no method for paying such expenses and other than providing for staff, does not provide for other commission expenses. PAR recommended that provisions of law be clarified concerning payment of commission expenses and that funds be provided, noting that the commission may have expenses of expert assistance, and public hearings, as well as personal expenses.
- PAR and others raised other procedural issues concerning the commission and approval of commission recommendations that may require legislation. (See Attachment 4.1 for PAR’s recommendations.)

¹ In fact, many pay raises have become effective during the term in which they were enacted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Compensation Review Commission, pursuant to Act No. 1040 of the 1999 Regular Session of the Legislature, makes the following recommendations:

- 1. That no changes in the salaries of statewide elected officials or legislators be made pending further study by the commission.***

Comment

The commission was appointed after the organizational session of the legislature in January, 2000. Act No. 1040 of 1999 R.S. (R.S. 42:1481 et seq.), the creating legislation, required that the commission “submit its recommendations ... to the legislature sixty days prior to the commencement of any regular session of the legislature in an even-numbered year”. In order to report this year, the commission must report by February 24, 2000. This time frame does not permit the commission to conduct the necessary study and receive the necessary testimony to determine salary recommendations this year. It will be necessary for the commission to have more time to complete its initial compensation recommendations.

- 2. That the commission make its first report recommending changes in compensation to the legislature not later than 60 days prior to the convening of the 2001 Regular Session of the legislature and that R.S. 42:1481 et seq. be amended to provide for commission reports in odd-numbered rather than even-numbered years.***

Comment

As noted above, Act No. 1040 of the 1999 Regular Session provides for the commission to report in an even numbered year. The present law (R.S. 42:1485) also permits commission reports every two years “at any regular session of the legislature in an even-numbered year”. Sessions in even-numbered years, so-called “fiscal sessions” are limited to specified legislation. Commission recommendations may concern matters other than the amounts of salary; they may include changes in other forms of compensation and expense payments and reimbursements. The law provides for approval by concurrent resolution of salaries recommended by the commission, but it does not mention other forms of compensation. Changes in statutes relative to other forms of compensation could not be considered in an even-numbered year.

- 3. That R.S. 42:1481 et seq. be amended to:***

- (a) Provide that the commission study and recommendations may include, not only salaries, but also other forms of compensation and expense payments for legislators and statewide elected officials and to clarify the meaning of these terms as necessary.***
- (b) Provide for more flexibility in provisions for the effective date of compensation changes as based upon commission recommendations.***
- (c) Address issues concerning procedures for the commission report and its approval by the legislature.***

Comment

The commission's study quickly revealed that it is not reasonable to examine salaries without looking at other kinds of compensation and expenses of these public officials and what provisions are made to meet those expenses. The commission report must necessarily address these other areas.

The present law provides for the recommended salaries to become effective on July 1 of the year the commission reports, if the report is approved by the legislature. It was pointed out that this provision would require a retroactive effective date in the event the commission report was approved by the legislature at a subsequent session. Discussion and testimony about the effective date of salary changes also included suggestions that pay changes not be effective during the term in which they are approved. In addition, there may be reason to make salary changes effective at other dates and times. For example, the Judicial Compensation Commission has recommended staggered increases for judges.

If the scope of commission study and recommendations is broadened to include more than salary as the commission recommends, it will be necessary also to change the provisions for adoption of the commission report and the effect of such adoption. Procedure for adoption of the report may also need clarification. It may be necessary to clarify whether some or all commission recommendations will require statutory change. (*Note: Also see recommendations of PAR concerning changes in law governing the commission in Appendix 4.1.*)

- 4. *That R.S. 42:1481 et seq. be amended to provide the method for payment of commission expenses and to specify what expenses will be paid.***

Comment

The present law (R.S. 42:1483) provides that the members of the commission "shall not receive compensation for their services, but shall be paid actual expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties as members of the commission". The law does not provide how these expenses are to be paid. In addition, the commission anticipate that there may be other limited expenses related to possible studies to be undertaken, costs of reports, and costs of conducting meetings at sites outside the capitol.

- 5. *That, in the event a special session of the legislature is called in 2000, legislation to implement this report be included in the call.***

Comment

The comments under Recommendations Nos. 1 and 2 above demonstrate the need for these matters to be considered by the legislature prior to the 2001 Regular Session.

APPENDICES

- 1.0 Minutes of organizational meeting (1/19/00)
 - 1.1 Statewide Elected Officials - Statutes printed by House Legislative Services
 - 1.2 Legislature - Statutes printed by House Legislative Services
 - 1.3 Retirement System - Statutes printed by House Legislative Services
 - 1.4 Louisiana House of Representatives, Compensation and Benefits - Quick reference prepared by House Legislative Services
 - 1.5 Organization of Executive Branch of State Government - Excerpt (pages 23-74) of the publication titled "State and Local Government in Louisiana: An Overview" prepared by House Legislative Services, 12/99
 - 1.6 Act No. 1040 of 1999 Regular Session - Relative to the creation of the Compensation Review Commission
- 2.0 Minutes of meeting (2/8/00)
 - 2.1 Judicial Compensation Commission - Correspondence from Judge Norris dated 2/2/00
 - 2.2 A Report on Judicial Salaries in Louisiana prepared by Loren C. Scott, Ph.D., 11/99
 - 2.3 Judicial Compensation Commission 1996 Report
 - 2.4 Classified Employees Earning \$70,000 or More Data as of 12/31/99 - Provided by Louisiana Department of State Civil Service
 - 2.5 Unclassified Employees Earning \$70,000 or More Data as of 12/31/99 - Provided by Louisiana Department of State Civil Service
 - 2.6 Unclassified Pay Schedule - Provided by Louisiana Department of State Civil Service
 - 2.7 Summary of Legislative Compensation and Expense Allowances for Louisiana - Prepared by House Legislative Services
 - 2.8 Abstract of per diem payments to members of the Louisiana House of Representatives and Senate for 1998 and 1999 - Prepared by House Legislative Services
 - 2.9 Governor's Compensation/Benefits/Selected States - Table prepared by House Legislative Services, 2/4/00
 - 2.10 Salary for Louisiana Statewide Elected Officials and Their Counterparts in Selected States - Table prepared by House Legislative Services, 2/4/00

- 2.11 Compensation studies of the offices of Clerk of Court and Assessor prepared by the Legislative Auditor in 1997 and accompanying memorandum prepared by House Legislative Services, 2/3/00
- 2.12 Salary, Emoluments, and Benefits of Louisiana Statewide Elected Officials and Heads of Executive Branch Departments Table prepared by House Legislative Services, 1/28/00, and accompanying memorandum prepared by House Legislative Services, 2/3/00, providing information concerning statutes, rules and procedures affecting travel and vehicle use by statewide elected officials
- 2.13 1999 Wage and Salary Survey provided by the Louisiana Municipal Association
- 2.14 Salary Survey provided by the Police Jury Association, 3/1/99
- 2.15 Louisiana Department of State Civil Service provided an information binder that included the following: pay plan (1/19/00), pay grids (effective 7/1/97), evaluation system (3/12/87), evaluation system point totals (6/27/88), and pay rules (5/6/92)
- 2.16 Mike Baer, Louisiana Senate Secretary, provided a map of current Senate districts and a map of current House districts
- 2.17 Richard Ieyoub, Attorney General, provided a listing of statutes (12/93) relative to his office
- 2.18 Richard Ieyoub, Attorney General, provided a copy of R.S. 36:703 relative to his office
- 2.19 Richard Ieyoub, Attorney General, provided a listing of certain salary information. Some information included the following: Department heads, Housing Authorities, Port Authorities, Judiciary, Sheriffs, Salaries of Public Employees, Salaries at Louisiana Universities, and other salary information
- 2.20 Richard Ieyoub, Attorney General, provided a binder titled "Administration Briefing Book" which includes information relative to his office
- 2.21 Senator Dardenne's legislative assistant provided a list of duties relative to her employment for Senator Dardenne
- 3.0 Minutes of meeting (2/9/00)
 - 3.1 Randy Haynie, lobbyist, provided his resume including a current listing of clients for Haynie & Associates
 - 3.2 Randy Haynie, lobbyist, provided an information sheet on lobbying
 - 3.3 Randy Haynie, lobbyist, provided information relative to the following: senate seniority chart, house seniority chart, seniority characteristics, legislators average number of years of service, characteristics of the 2000 legislature compared to 1996, party affiliation of Louisiana legislators, racial composition of Louisiana legislature, gender composition of Louisiana legislature, highest degree earned by Louisiana legislators, and other facts about

2000 legislature

- 3.4 Jack Caldwell, Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources, provided a rough draft of the Strategic Plan for his department
- 3.5 Jack Caldwell, Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources, provided information relative to organizational structure of his department
- 3.6 Jack Caldwell, Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources, provided an information sheet including a list of department programs, number of employees, and executive budget
- 3.7 House Legislative Service provided information relative to the compensation and expenses of House members (2/9/00)
- 4.0 Minutes of meeting (2/10/00)
 - 4.1 Jim Brandt, President of the Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, Inc. (PAR), provided verbal recommendations to the commission (written recommendations were submitted to the commission in correspondence dated 2/14/00)
 - 4.2 Jim Brandt, President of the Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, Inc. (PAR), provided a copy of articles relative to legislative pay published in the July/August 1997 issue of "State Legislatures"
 - 4.3 Jim Brandt, President of the Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, Inc. (PAR), provided information relative to legislative pay from a legislative bulletin by PAR dated 5/2/97 (a copy of the bulletin was provided on 2/14/00)
 - 4.4 Bud Mapes, lobbyist, provided information relative to frequently asked questions about the supplemental monthly allowance of legislators
 - 4.5 House Legislative Services provided a copy of a memorandum issued by the Louisiana Board of Ethics on 1/21/99 relative to use of campaign funds for Mardi Gras activities
 - 4.6 Senate staff provided a copy of Opinion No. 98-232, dated 9/17/98, by the Louisiana Board of Ethics acting as the Supervisory Committee on Campaign Finance Disclosure relative to the appropriate use of campaign funds
- 5.0 Minutes of meeting (2/16/00)
- 6.0 Additional attachments
 - 6.1 Comparison of Executive Branch Departments - Table prepared by House Legislative Services
 - 6.2 Positions in State Service Paying \$70,000 or More - Table prepared by House Legislative Services

*The attachments for this report are on file with the House Legislative Services Research Library
and the Committee on House and Governmental Affairs.*